

JAN 08 2007

SN: 09/875,692

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 60001.0016US01/MS150592.1

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed September 6, 2006 and the advisory action mailed December 4, 2006. Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-28 were examined in the Office Action. Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-28 were rejected. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 12-18, and 20-23 have been amended within a scope of the previous claim set. Claims 3, 5, 10, 11, and 19 have been canceled. No new claims have been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and examination in view of the above after final amendments and the following remarks.

Substance of Interview Summary

A telephonic interview occurred between the undersigned, Murrell Blackburn, and Examiner Cindy Nguyen on Tuesday, December 19, 2006. The interview covered the continued rejections to Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Hita et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,081,774 (hereinafter "de Hita") in view of Richards et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,995,921 (hereinafter "Richards").

The undersigned pointed out to the Examiner that Amended independent claim 1 incorporated the features of dependent claims and thus, new issues had not been raised. Specifically, independent claim 1 incorporates features from dependent claims 3, 7, and 8. The Examiner suggested that language from the dependent claims be incorporated in the independent claims in verbatim and that the other independent claims without dependency have the amendment removed. Thus, the undersigned has complied with the Examiner's suggestions. The Examiner indicated that the amendment and remarks would likely be entered and examined if her suggestions were implemented. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the arguments made by the undersigned have merit, however amendment entry and further examination is still required. This written response is thus, submitted in follow-up to the telephonic interview for consideration by the Examiner, as it is believed to have placed the application in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner send another Office Action, Applicants respectfully request another interview to determine what claim amendments would be sufficient for a notice of allowance.

SN: 09/875,692

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 60001.0016US01/MS150592.1

Claim Objection – 35 USC § 112

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for not distinctly claiming the subject matter regarded as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 16 accordingly to overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 12-15 and 20-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is believed that claim 24 was rejected under section 101 in error. Thus, only claims 12-15 and 20-23 have been accordingly amended to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Hita et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,081,774 (hereinafter “de Hita”) in view of Richards et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,995,921 (hereinafter “Richards”). Applicants respectfully submit that de Hita in view of Richards does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claimed invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 12, 16, 20 and 25.

Claim 1

Applicants' claimed invention as recited in amended claim 1 is drawn to a computer-implemented method of searching for a help utility. The method comprises, among other features, searching a single database containing a plurality of help files and wizards received in the database from all of a plurality of different computer operating systems, wherein the plurality of help files and wizards are associated with the plurality of different operating systems and assist in maintaining and configuring the plurality of different computer operating systems; if after the step of searching the database containing the plurality of help files and wizards, at least one wizard of the plurality of help files and wizards is found matching the keywords, executing the at least one wizard; if after the step of searching the database containing the plurality of help files and wizards, no help files or wizards are found matching the keywords, then: providing the utility search dialog; receiving one or more additional keywords directed to at least one of the plurality of help files and one wizards; and searching the database containing the plurality of help files and wizards. The plurality of help files and wizards are in a variety of different languages.

SN: 09/875,692

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 60001.0016US01/MS150592.1

In contrast, de Hita discloses an information retrieval system for retrieving information from a database in response to natural language queries. The database, as disclosed in de Hita, contains help text files that provide a user with information to assist in the operation of an associated software program. The help information of de Hita does not disclose a plurality of help files and wizards associated with the plurality of different operating systems that assist in maintaining and configuring the plurality of different computer operating systems. The wizards recited in amended claim 1 are not analogous to developing help information as disclosed in de Hita. The help information of de Hita does not teach or suggest a wizard. (Column 7, lines 1-7). Wizards don't simply provide help information, wizards help perform a particular task. Thus, de Hita does not disclose finding and executing a wizard as recited in claim 1.

Further, the Office Action misinterprets Applicants arguments as agreeing that de Hita has more than one operating system from which help utilities are received in a single database. (See Office Action, page 2 lines 3-8). To the contrary, Applicants traverse this misinterpretation and respectfully submit that nowhere in de Hita is there disclosure of a single database containing help files and wizards received in the database from all of a plurality of different computer operating systems. It is very clear from de Hita, that no wizards are disclosed or suggested and that the software developer 110 develops the help project 114 and that the help text files are not received in any database from the associated single software program, but from the developer 110. (See de Hita, column 6, lines 46- 58). There is also no indication that the help text files of de Hita are in a single database and assist in maintaining and configuring the plurality of different computer operating systems as recited in amended claim 1. De Hita only refers to operating systems 220 or 260 being the same operating system not different operating systems as recited in amended claim 1. (See de Hita, column 9, lines 20-47). De Hita does not teach or suggest that operating system 220 or 260 is involved as a plurality of different computer operating systems as recited in amended claim 1. (Column 8, line 40).

The Office Action acknowledges that de Hita does not disclose providing the utility search dialog; receiving one or more additional keywords directed to at least one of the plurality of help files and wizards as recited in amended claim 1. However, the Office Action relies on Richards to resolve the deficiencies of de Hita, stating that Richards discloses providing a wizard search dialog and receiving input of search keywords directed to a help utility. Applicants disagree and further assert there is no indication in Richards that dialog 306 or fig. 3B disclose a

SN: 09/875,692

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 60001.0016US01/MS150592.1

"wizard search dialog". (See Richards, column 9, lines 7-22). Richards, also teaches away from receiving additional keywords. (See Richards, column 10, lines 9-15). Thus, Richards does not disclose receiving additional keywords directed to one of the plurality of help files and wizards, because neither de Hita alone, or in combination with Richards, discloses at least one or a plurality of wizards as recited in amended claim 1.

Still in further contrast, de Hita only discloses that languages such as English, Dutch, or Spanish are used in normal discourse. Nowhere in de Hita is it disclosed that a plurality of help files and wizards in a single database are in a variety of different languages as recited in amended claim 1. (Column 5, lines 51 to column 6, line 15). The single natural language disclosed in de Hita is typically used by people in normal discourse. This does not disclose that the help files and wizards are in a database in a variety of different languages. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over de Hita in view of Richards for at least this reason also.

Claim 12

Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in amended claim 12, is drawn to a computer storage medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer perform, among other features, the steps of inputting one or more search keywords directed to one of a plurality of help files and wizards; searching one database containing the plurality of help files and wizards including help files and wizards provided to the database by a plurality of different computer operating systems that are connected in a network to assist a user in utilizing the different computer operating systems to configure hardware of a set of peripheral devices; finding a wizard matching the keywords; executing the wizard; and if after the step of searching the database, no help file or wizard is found matching the keywords but a related wizard is found that closely approximates the keywords, then displaying the related wizard.

As described above with respect to amended claim 1, de Hita does not teach or suggest finding a wizard matching the keywords and executing the wizard. Applicants respectfully assert that the help information of de Hita does not disclose a plurality of help files and wizards associated with the plurality of different operating systems that assist in maintaining and configuring the plurality of different computer operating systems. The wizards recited in amended claim 1 are not analogous to developing help information as disclosed in de Hita. The help information of de Hita does not teach or suggest a wizard. (Column 7, lines 1-7). Wizards

SN: 09/875,692

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 60001.0016US01/MS150592.1

don't simply provide help information, wizards help perform a particular task. Richards does not cure this deficiency. Thus, Applicants' amended claim 12 is also allowable over de Hita in view of Richards.

Claim 16

Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in claim 16, is drawn to a system for searching for a help utility. The system comprises a computer program module operative, among other features, to input one or more search terms directed to one of a plurality of help files and wizards wherein each help file or wizard is provided to a database by and associated with a different operating system to guide a user in configuring or utilizing that operating system; to search the database containing the plurality of help files and wizards; to find a wizard matching at least one of the search terms; and to execute the wizard.

As described above with respect to amended claims 1 and 12, de Hita and Richards are deficient with respect to disclosing wizards as recited in amended claim 1. Providing wizards are not analogous to developing help information as disclosed in de Hita. The help information of de Hita does not teach or suggest a wizard. (Column 7, lines 1-7). Wizards don't simply provide help information, wizards help perform a particular task. Richards does not cure this deficiency. Thus, claim 16 is also allowable over de Hita in view of Richards.

Claim 20

Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in claim 20, is drawn to a computer storage medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer perform, among other features, the steps of receiving search keywords directed to at least one help file or wizard; searching a plurality of help files and wizards across a variety of computer operating systems wherein the plurality of help files and wizards are associated with and assist in maintaining or configuring the variety of computer operating systems; and finding a wizard matching the keywords.

As described above with respect to amended claim 1, the wizards recited in amended claim 1 are not analogous to developing help information as disclosed in de Hita. The help information of de Hita does not teach or suggest a wizard. (Column 7, lines 1-7). Wizards don't simply provide help information, wizards help perform a particular task. Richards does not cure this deficiency. Thus, claim 20 is also allowable over de Hita in view of Richards.

SN: 09/875,692

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 60001.0016US01/MS150592.1

Claim 25

Applicants' claimed invention, as recited in amended claim 25, is drawn to a computer-implemented method for searching and managing a plurality of files and wizards. The method comprises, among other features, providing a help file and wizard search dialog via an interface of a computer; receiving via the interface a search keyword directed to a help file or wizard; in response to receiving the search keyword, searching the plurality of help files and wizards across a plurality of computer operating systems and a plurality of computer software applications; finding a wizard matching the keywords; and executing the wizard matching the keyword.

As described above with respect to amended claims 1 and 20, the help information of de Hita does not teach or suggest a wizard. (Column 7, lines 1-7). Wizards don't simply provide help information, wizards help perform a particular task. Richards does not cure this deficiency. Thus, Applicants' amended claim 25 is also allowable over de Hita in view of Richards.

Dependent Claims 2, 4, 6-9, 13-15, 17-18, and 21-24, and 26-28

At least because claims 2, 4, 6-9, 13-15, 17-18, and 21-24, and 26-28 inherit the language of independent claims 1, 12, 16, 20 or 25 claims, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4, 6-9, 13-15, 17-18, and 21-24, and 26-28 are also allowable over de Hita in view of Richards for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would

SN: 09/875,692

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 60001.0016US01/MS150592.1

advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 8, 2007



Murrell W. Blackburn,
Reg. No. 50,881
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404-954-5100

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEST AVAILABLE COPY